

## **REMARKS**

Claims 1-3, 6-10, 12-13, 16-35, and 37-42, all the claims pending in the application, stand rejected on prior art grounds. Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections based on the following discussion. The following paragraphs have been numbered for ease of future reference.

### **I. The Prior Art Rejections**

[0001] Claims 1, 10, 33, and 41-42 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Privault, et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2004/0128122), hereinafter referred to as Privault. Applicants respectfully traverse.

[0002] Privault does not disclose, teach or even suggest at least the features directed to:

- 1) using said computer, matching said predetermined set of regular expressions to said plurality of POS tag sequences from said text document to provide one or more extracted opinions; and
- 2) using said computer, lexically analyzing each word of said one or more extracted opinions to group said one or more extracted opinions into clusters of extracted opinions, as recited in independent claim 1 and similarly recited in independent claims 10 and 33.

[0003] Instead, Privault merely describes how multiword expressions are mapped to identifiers using finite-state networks. Each of a plurality of multiword expressions is encoded into a regular expression. Each regular expression encodes a base form common to a plurality of derivative forms defined by ones of the multiword expressions. Each of the plurality of regular expressions is compiled with factorization into a set of finite-state networks. A union of the finite-state networks in the set of finite-state networks is performed to define a multiword finite-state network and a set of subnets. The multiword finite-state network and the set of subnets are traversed to identify a path corresponding to one of the plurality of multiword expressions, wherein only transitions originating from the multiword finite-state network are accounted for to ascertain a path number identifying a base form of the one of the plurality of multiword expressions.

[0004] The 12/9/2009 Communication states:

“[u]sing said computer, matching said predetermined set of regular expressions to said plurality of pos tag sequences from said text document by to provide one or more

extracted opinions (*referring to paragraphs 66-69*).” (12/9/2009 Communication, p. 3, ll. 16-18).

[0005] Applicants respectfully submit that Privault, paras. 66-69 relate to a statement. However, there is no indication that this statement is an opinion. Moreover, Privault’s example in para. 74 addresses matching idiomatic expressions “he promised to do the washing up”. These idiomatic expressions are clearly statements of fact rather than opinion. In contrast, Applicants’ claims specifically recite the extraction of opinions. Thus, the independent claims define patentable subject matter over Privault for at least these reasons.

[0006] The 12/9/2009 Communication states:

“[u]sing said computer, lexically analyzing each word of said one or more extracted opinions to group said one or more extracted opinions into clusters of extracted opinions (*referring to paragraph 72; return extracted regular expression and categorization information*)” (12/9/2009 Communication, p. 3, ll. 19-22).

[0007] However, as noted above, and notwithstanding the assertions in the Communication, Privault fails to even mention the term opinion. Thus, it is puzzling how it could be asserted that Privault extracts them.

[0008] The 12/9/2009 Communication states:

“[u]sing said computer, graphically displaying said clusters of extracted opinions, wherein said graphically displaying comprises displaying relative proportions of said extracted opinions in said clusters of extracted opinions (*referring to paragraphs 72-73; a cluster includes all possible senses of extracted regular expressions; each of these regular expressions are shown in relative of the others*)”. (12/9/2009 Communication, p. 4, ll. 1-5).

[0009] As noted above, Privault fails to disclose the extraction of opinions. Thus Privault cannot disclose graphically displaying said clusters of extracted opinions... as recited in independent claim 33. Thus, independent claim 3 defines patentable subject matter over Privault for at least these reasons.

[0010] Claims 2-3, 6-9, 12-13, 16-19, 29-30, 34-35, and 37-40 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Privault, in view of Subasic, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,721,734), hereinafter referred to as Subasic. Applicants respectfully traverse.

[0011] As previously noted, Subasic merely describes a technique for analyzing affect in which ambiguity in both emotion and natural language is explicitly represented and processed through fuzzy logic. In particular, textual information is processed to i) isolate a vocabulary of

words belonging to an emotion, ii) represent the meaning of each word belonging to that emotion using multiple categories and scalar metrics, iii) compute profiles for text documents based on the categories and scores of their component words, and iv) manipulate the profiles to visualize the texts. The representation vehicle in the system is a set of fuzzy semantic categories (affect categories) followed by their respective centralities (degrees of relatedness between lexicon entries and their various categories) and intensities (representative of the strength of the affect level described by that word) called an affect set. A graphical representation of the affect set can also be used as a tool for decision making.

[0012] The Communication does not assert that Subasic remedies any of the above-identified deficiencies of Privault, nor does it. Thus, claims 1, 10 and 33 define patentable subject matter over Privault, alone or in combination with Subasic. Claims 2-3, 6-9, 12-13, 16-19, 29-30, 34-35 and 37-40 depend from claims 1, 10 and 33 and therefore define patentable subject matter for at least the same reasons.

[0013] Claims 31-32 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Privault, in view of Subasic, and further in view of Chase (U.S. Patent No. 6,332,143). Applicants respectfully traverse.

[0014] Chase merely describes a computerized interactive language reference system includes a database of terms with associated denotative, connotative and human interest information. The system goes through each word of a passage and determines whether there is an entry in the database for such word. For each term where there is an entry, there is a check to see if the term has more than one denotative meaning. Where there is more than one denotative meaning, an appropriate one of the denotative meanings is selected. The system evaluates the passage for positive emotional connotations, negative emotional connotations, global emotional connotations, human interest, connotations of power, connotations of activity and connotations of abstractness/concreteness. Dominant emotional connotations and dominant words also are specifically identified and ranked.

[0015] The Communication does not assert that Chase remedies any of the above-identified deficiencies of Privault-Subasic, nor does it. Thus, claims 1, 10 and 33 define patentable subject matter over Privault-Subasic, alone or in combination with Chase. Claims 31-

32 depend from claims 1 and 10 and therefore define patentable subject matter for at least the same reasons.

[0016] The claimed invention, as provided in amended independent claims 1, 10 and 33 contain features, which are patentably distinguishable from the prior art references of record.

[0017] Moreover, the Applicants note that all claims are properly supported in the specification and accompanying drawings, and no new matter is being added. In view of the foregoing, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections.

## **II. Formal Matters and Conclusion**

[0018] With respect to the rejections to the claims, the claims have been amended, above, to overcome these rejections. In view of the foregoing, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections to the claims.

[0019] In view of the foregoing, Applicants submit that claims 1-3, 6-10, 12-13, 16-35, and 37-42, all the claims presently pending in the application, are patentably distinct from the prior art of record and are in condition for allowance. The Examiner is respectfully requested to pass the above application to issue at the earliest possible time.

[0020] Should the Examiner find the application to be other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned at the local telephone number listed below to discuss any other changes deemed necessary. Please charge any deficiencies and credit any overpayments to Attorney's Deposit Account Number 09-0441.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: February 9, 2010

/Christian Austin-Hollands/  
Christian Austin-Hollands, Esq.  
Registration No. 46,527

Gibb I.P. Law Firm, LLC  
844 West Street, Suite 100  
Annapolis, MD 21401  
Voice: (410) 705-6400  
Fax: (410)-630-1656  
Customer Number: 29154